

1 Paul L. More, SBN 228589  
2 F. Benjamin Kowalczyk, SBN 316796  
3 McCACKEN, STEMERMAN & HOLSBERRY  
4 595 Market Street, Suite 800  
5 San Francisco, California 94105  
6 Tel. No.: (415) 597-7200  
7 Fax No.: (415) 597-7200  
8 E-mail: pmore@msh.law

9  
10 *Attorneys for Petitioner*

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

INTERNATIONAL  
BROTHERHOOD OF  
TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 396,

Plaintiff,  
vs.

NASA SERVICES, INC.; and DOES  
I through X,

Respondents.

Case No.: 2:18-cv-03681-KS

INTERNATIONAL  
BROTHERHOOD OF  
TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 396's  
**BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION TO COMPEL  
ARBITRATION**

Date: August 20, 2018, 1:30 p.m.

Judge: Hon. Stephen Wilson

Location: Courtroom 10A

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	BACKGROUND.....	2
2		
3		
4	<i>The “Zero Waste LA” Exclusive Franchise Ordinance.....</i>	2
5		
6	<i>The RFP and NASA’s Negotiation of the Labor Peace Agreement.....</i>	4
7		
8	<i>The LPA’s Relation to NASA’s Exclusive Franchise.....</i>	6
9		
10	<i>The City’s Award of an Exclusive Franchise to NASA.....</i>	8
11		
12	<i>The Union’s Meetings with NASA and Demand for Arbitration.....</i>	10
13		
14	ARGUMENT.....	12
15		
16	I. NASA Bears the Heavy Burden of Demonstrating That the Parties’	
17	Dispute is Not Arbitrable.....	12
18		
19	II. Whether the Agreement “Became Null and Void” on January 1,	
20	2017 is for the Arbitrator to Decide.....	14
21		
22	A. Under <i>Buckeye Check Cashing</i> , only challenges to an arbitration	
23	clause, not challenges to the contract itself, are for the courts to	
24	decide.....	14
25		
26	B. Disputes over the effectiveness of conditions precedent are	
27	arbitrable under <i>Buckeye Check Cashing</i> . ....	18
28		

1	C. The parties do not have a dispute about contract formation within	
2	the meaning of <i>Granite Rock</i> .....	20
3		
4	III. NASA Waived Its Claim that the LPA Became Void by Accepting	
5	the Agreement's Benefits.....	22
6		
7	IV. NASA Is Required to Pay the Union's Legal Expenses as a Matter	
8	of Contract. ....	24
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Bridgeport Mgmt., Inc. v. Lake Mathews Mineral Properties, Ltd.</i> , No. 14-CV-00070-JST, 2014 WL 953831 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2014) .....	14
<i>Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegnas</i> , 546 U.S. 440 (2006) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Capitol Vial, Inc. v. Weber Scientific</i> , 966 F.Supp. 1108 (M.D.Ala. 1997) .....	19
<i>Citicorp Real Estate, Inc. v. Smith</i> , 155 F.3d 1097 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	22
<i>Dennis L. Christensen General Building Contractor, Inc., v. General Building Contractor, Inc.</i> , 952 F.2d 1073 (9th Cir. 1991) .....	13
<i>Directors of Motion Picture Indus. Pension Plan v. Nu Image Inc.</i> , No. 2:13-CV-03224-CAS, 2014 WL 808859 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 28, 2014) .....	24
<i>Granite Rock Co. v. International Brotherhood of Teamsters</i> , 561 U.S. 287 (2010) .....	20, 21
<i>Granite Rock. Solymar Investments, Ltd. v. Banco Santander S.A.</i> , 672 F.3d 981 (11th Cir. 2012) .....	20
<i>Hotel Employees &amp; Rest. Employees Union, Local 2 v. Marriott Corp.</i> , No. C-89-2707 MHP, 1993 WL 341286 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 1993) .....	22

1	<i>Hotel Employees &amp; Restaurant Employees Local 2 v. Marriott</i>	
2	<i>Corp.</i> , 961 F.2d 1464 (9th Cir. 1992).....	12, 23
3	<i>Matthews v. Nat'l Football League Mgmt. Council</i> ,	
4	688 F.3d 1107 (9th Cir. 2012).....	13
5	<i>Morgan v. Gonzales</i> ,	
6	495 F.3d 1084 (9th Cir. 2007).....	24
7	<i>Moses Cone Mem'l Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp.</i> ,	
8	460 U.S. 1 (1983).....	13
9	<i>Nash v. UCSF Med. Ctr.</i> ,	
10	No. 11-CV-4473 JSC, 2013 WL 4487503 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2013) .....	22
11	<i>Navarro v. F.D.I.C.</i> ,	
12	371 F.3d 979 (7th Cir. 2004).....	17
13	<i>Nicaragua v. Standard Fruit Company</i> ,	
14	937 F.2d 469 (9th Cir. 1991).....	15
15	<i>Oil Chem. &amp; Atomic Workers Int'l Union v. Union Oil Co. of</i>	
16	<i>California</i> ,	
17	457 F.Supp. 179 (C.D. Cal. 1978) .....	14
18	<i>Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood &amp; Conklin Mfg. Co.</i> ,	
19	388 U.S. 395 (1967) .....	20
20	<i>Rent-A-Ctr., W., Inc. v. Jackson</i> ,	
21	561 U.S. 63 (2010).....	15
22	<i>Service Employees Int'l Union v. St. Vincent Medical Ctr.</i> ,	
23	344 F.3d 977 (9th Cir. 2003).....	12
24	<i>Sheet Metal Workers' Int'l Ass'n v. United Transp. Union</i> ,	
25	767 F. Supp. 2d 161 (D.D.C. 2011) .....	20
26	<i>Smart v. Int'l Broth. Of Elec. Workers, Local 702</i> ,	
27	315 F.3d 721 (7th Cir. 2002).....	13
28		

1	<i>South Bay Boston Mgmt., Inc. v. Unite Here Local 26,</i> 587 F.3d 35 (2009).....	12, 23
2		
3	<i>Tompkins v. 23andMe, Inc.,</i> 840 F.3d 1016 (9th Cir. 2016).....	15
4		
5	<i>Transdyn/Cresci v. City &amp; Cty. of San Francisco,</i> 72 Cal.App.4th 746 (1999) .....	16
6		
7	<i>U.S. Titan, Inc. v. Guangzhou Zhen Hua Shipping Co.,</i> 182 F.R.D. 97 (S.D.N.Y. 1998).....	18
8		
9	<i>Unite Here Local 217 v. Sage Hosp. Res.,</i> 642 F.3d 255 (1st Cir. 2011) .....	21
10		
11	<i>Unite Here Local 355 v. Calder Race Course, Inc.,</i> No. 10-22355-CIV, 2010 WL 11553588 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 7, 2010).....	19
12		
13	<i>United Brotherhood of Carpenters &amp; Joiners of America, Local</i> <i>No. 1780 v. Desert Palace, Inc.,</i> 94 F.3d 1308 (9th Cir. 1996).....	13
14		
15	<i>United Steel, Paper, etc. v. TriMas Corp.,</i> 531 F.3d 531 (7th Cir. 2008).....	12
16		
17	<i>United Steelworkers v. Warrior &amp; Gulf Navigation Co.,</i> 363 U.S. 574 (1960) .....	13
18		
19	<i>Williams v. City of Stockton,</i> 195 Cal. 743 (1925) .....	17
20		
21	<b>Federal Statutes</b>	
22		
23	Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 1 <i>et seq.</i> .....	13, 14, 15
24	9 U.S.C. § 4.....	14
25	9 U.S.C. § 10.....	14
26		
27	Labor-Management Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. § 185 .....	12, 13, 14, 22, 24
28		

1 **State Statutes**

2 Cal. Civil Code § 1691 ..... 22

3 **Other Authorities**

4 City of Los Angeles Bureau of Sanitation, "Final Report:  
5 Exclusive Commercial and Multifamily Solid Waste Franchise  
6 Hauling System Implementation Plan" (April 2013)..... 2

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

## 1 INTRODUCTION

2 Teamsters Local 396 (the “Union”) and NASA Services, Inc. (“NASA”)  
3 executed a “Labor Peace Agreement” (the “LPA”) in late 2014. Being party  
4 to such an agreement was a condition of NASA obtaining a lucrative waste-  
5 hauling franchise with the City of Los Angeles. The LPA contains a broad  
6 arbitration clause, under which “any dispute over the interpretation or  
7 application” of the agreement is subject to arbitration. The LPA also  
8 includes several conditions, which relate to NASA obtaining a city  
9 franchise. The parties have a dispute over the meaning and application of  
10 one such condition: whether the City “entered into an exclusive franchise  
11 agreement” with NASA prior to January 1, 2017. The Union maintains  
12 that the City did, because all of the discretionary, legislative requirements  
13 for entering the franchise agreement were met before that date and the  
14 final step of signing the contract was ministerial and mandatory. NASA  
15 seeks to avoid its obligations under the LPA—despite having relied on the  
16 validity of the LPA to obtain and maintain its exclusive franchise—by  
17 arguing that its franchise agreement with the City was not signed by the  
18 City’s Board of Public Works President until January 31, 2017.

19 Under well-established precedent, this dispute over the meaning of  
20 the parties’ agreement is a matter for arbitration. NASA’s challenge is to  
21 the validity of the parties’ entire agreement, not specifically to its  
22 arbitration clause. *Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegn*a, 546 U.S.  
23 440, 446 (2006).

24 Even if NASA were correct that interpreting the LPA’s condition were  
25 a matter for the Court—and even if the Court agreed that NASA could  
26 avoid its bargain with the Union based on the LPA’s language—NASA did  
27 not promptly repudiate the LPA when the Union invoked it in February  
28 2017. Instead, NASA benefited from the LPA’s restrictions against the

1 Union striking or taking other economic action against it and from the  
2 exclusive franchise it obtained based on the LPA's existence and validity.  
3 Under these circumstances, NASA has waived any claim that the LPA  
4 became void based on the agreement's terms.

5 **BACKGROUND**

6 ***The “Zero Waste LA” Exclusive Franchise Ordinance***

7 In April 2014, the City of Los Angeles adopted the “Zero Waste LA”  
8 Exclusive Franchise Ordinance (the “Franchise Ordinance”), Ordinance No.  
9 182986. *See* Request for Judicial Notice (“RJN”), Exh. 1. The Franchise  
10 Ordinance replaced Los Angeles’s previous, permit-based commercial and  
11 multi-family residential solid-waste collection system with an exclusive  
12 franchise system.<sup>1</sup> The Franchise Ordinance divided the City into eleven  
13 franchise “zones”, each of which has a designated exclusive waste-hauler  
14 for commercial and multi-family residential collection. Franchise  
15 Ordinance, RJN, Exh. 1, at § 66.33.4. The Franchise Ordinance set other  
16 substantive standards that are designed to increase the diversion of solid  
17 waste from landfills and to increase recycling and composting, all in order  
18 to meet the City’s goal of achieving “zero waste” by 2030. *Id.*, at § 66.33  
19 (“Purpose”).

20 The City expected that the move from a largely unregulated permit  
21 system to an exclusive franchise system would yield significant  
22 environmental benefits. But it also recognized that creating exclusive,  
23 zone-based franchises increased the potential that labor disputes would  
24 interfere with waste collection. It therefore required that exclusive  
25 franchise haulers be parties to agreements with labor unions that barred

---

27 <sup>1</sup> *See, generally*, City of Los Angeles, Bureau of Sanitation, “Final Report: Exclusive  
28 Commercial and Multifamily Solid Waste Franchise Hauling System Implementation  
Plan” (April 2013), at 1.1. Available at: <https://www.lacitysan.org/cs/groups/public/documents/document/mhfh/mdax/~edisp/qa001033.pdf> (last visited July 23, 2018).

1 strikes, picking and other economic actions against city waste-collection  
2 services. As the City put it:

3 While the move to an exclusive franchise system will generate many  
4 benefits for the City and its residents, it will also increase the risk  
5 that a labor dispute will interfere with collection services. To protect  
6 the City's interest in efficient and uninterrupted collection services,  
7 the City will require franchisees to produce evidence that they are  
8 parties to written, enforceable agreements that prohibit labor  
9 organizations and their members from engaging in picketing, work  
stoppages, boycotts or other economic interference with collection  
services.

10 *Id.*, at § 66.33.

11 This requirement that franchisees be parties to “labor peace  
12 agreements” is contained in Franchise Ordinance § 66.33.6(c). That  
13 provision makes clear that being *party* to a labor peace agreement is a  
14 prerequisite to being granted a franchise and is an ongoing requirement of  
15 being a franchisee:

16 As a condition for the grant of a franchise agreement, a condition  
17 precedent to any franchisee or subcontractor performing collection  
18 services, and as an ongoing, material condition of the franchise  
19 agreement, each franchisee shall provide satisfactory evidence that it,  
20 and any subcontractor who will provide collection services, are a party  
21 to labor peace agreement(s) with any labor organization that  
22 represents any group of the franchisee's or subcontractor's employees  
23 who are or will be involved in providing collection services, and with  
24 any labor organization that seeks to represent any group of a  
franchisee's or subcontractor's employees who are or will be involved  
in providing collection services[.]

25 *Id.*, at § 66.33.6(c). The Franchise Ordinance defines a “labor peace  
26 agreement” as “an enforceable agreement between a franchisee . . . and a  
27 labor organization . . . that represents or seeks to represent the franchisee's  
28 . . . employees providing collection services and that contains provisions

1 under which the labor organization for itself and its members agrees to  
2 refrain from engaging in any picketing, work stoppages, or any other  
3 economic interference with the franchisee's performance of collection  
4 services." *Id.*, at § 66.33.1(6).

5 ***The RFP and NASA's Negotiation of the Labor Peace Agreement***

6 Consistent with the terms of the Franchise Ordinance, the City's  
7 Bureau of Sanitation issued a Request for Proposals on June 11, 2014.  
8 Bureau of Sanitation, Request for Proposals: Citywide Exclusive Franchise  
9 System for Municipal Solid-Waste Collection and Handling ("RFP"), RJN,  
10 Exh. 2. Section 2.4.5.1 of the RFP required that proposers be party to a  
11 labor peace agreement:

12 In accordance with Section 66.33.6(c) of the Los Angeles Municipal  
13 Code, the CONTRACTOR shall provide satisfactory evidence that it,  
14 and any SUBCONTRACTOR who will provide collection services, are  
a *party* to labor peace agreement[.]

15 *Id.*, at § 2.4.5.1 (emphasis added). Section 3.10.15.6 of the RFP required  
16 applicants to submit "[a]n affidavit verifying compliance with Article  
17 2.4.5.1 of this RFP and Section 66.33.6(c) of the Los Angeles Municipal  
18 Code." *Id.*, at § 3.10.15.6 (p. 68). The RFP included a certification form on  
19 which the proposer would attest that it was a party to a labor peace  
20 agreement ("Form 15 - Evidence of Signed Labor Peace Agreement"). *See*  
21 *id.*, at p. viii.

22 In September 2014, NASA approached Teamsters Local 396 about  
23 negotiating a labor peace agreement. The parties' representatives agreed  
24 on a labor peace agreement on October 24, 2014, and Union and NASA  
25 representatives signed the agreement on October 26 and October 27, 2014,  
26 respectively. More Decl., ¶ 2; Pet. to Compel, Doc. No. 1, Exh. A.

27 The labor peace agreement ("LPA") covers certain employees at  
28 NASA's facility at 1100 S. Maple Avenue in Montebello, California. Doc.

1 No. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 1. Under the LPA, the Union agrees that “[d]uring the  
 2 term of this Agreement, the Union will not engage in striking, picketing or  
 3 other economic activity at the facility.” *Id.*, Exh. A, ¶ 11. The LPA contains  
 4 other substantive provisions, including NASA’s agreement to remain  
 5 neutral toward its employees’ decision on whether or not to unionize,  
 6 certain rights for the Union to access NASA’s facility and communicate  
 7 with its employees, a procedure for recognizing the Union as the majority  
 8 representative of the covered employees, and provision for interest  
 9 arbitration if the parties are unable to reach agreement on a first collective  
 10 bargaining agreement. *Id.*, Exh. A, ¶¶ 4, 7-10.

11 The LPA also contains a broad arbitration provision, which states:  
 12 “The parties agree that any disputes over the interpretation or application  
 13 of this Agreement shall be submitted to expedited and binding arbitration.”  
 14 *Id.*, Exh. A, ¶ 14.

15 The parties could not mutually agree on named arbitrators to include  
 16 in the LPA prior to its execution, so the LPA instead contains a procedure  
 17 for selecting arbitrators “if the parties are not otherwise able to agree upon  
 18 a permanent arbitrator.” *Id.*, Exh. A, ¶ 14. The parties agreed in  
 19 Paragraph 14 that if they were unable to agree on permanent arbitrators  
 20 within 30 days after the LPA’s execution, they would obtain a list of  
 21 arbitrators from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and  
 22 alternatively strike names. *Ibid.* The parties also agreed that “[a]ny party  
 23 who unsuccessfully resists arbitration or an arbitration award under this  
 24 Agreement shall be liable for the other party’s legal fees and expenses for  
 25 enforcement.” *Ibid.*

26 NASA relied on the executed LPA in responding to the exclusive-  
 27 franchise RFP and, ultimately, in obtaining a lucrative exclusive waste-  
 28 hauling franchise from the City. NASA submitted a signed “Form 15”

1 along with its RFP response. This signed verification (which the Union  
 2 countersigned) stated that “[t]he Company is party to an agreement with  
 3 Teamsters Local 396 that meets the definition of a Labor Peace  
 4 Agreement.” More Decl., ¶ 4, Exh. 1. The Union is unaware of any  
 5 subsequent representation by NASA to the City that it was, in fact, *not* a  
 6 party to an LPA that would qualify it for consideration as a franchisee or  
 7 that the LPA is no longer in effect.

8 After the execution of the LPA, NASA’s and the Union’s attorneys  
 9 conferred, pursuant to Paragraph 14, over the identity of the arbitrator to  
 10 hear disputes under the LPA. More Decl., ¶ 5. Because those negotiations  
 11 took more than the 30 days prescribed in Paragraph 14, the Union sought,  
 12 and NASA granted, an extension on the deadline to choose arbitrators. *Id.*,  
 13 ¶ 5, Exh. 2. The parties ultimately reached agreement on Arbitrator  
 14 Michael Rappaport as the permanent arbitrator under the LPA. The  
 15 parties memorialized this agreement in an “Addendum to Memorandum of  
 16 Agreement.” More Decl., ¶ 6, Exh. 3. The Addendum recited that the  
 17 parties had entered into the LPA on October 24, 2014 and that Paragraph  
 18 14 of that Agreement “provides for expedited and binding arbitration of  
 19 disputes arising over the interpretation or application of the Agreement.”  
 20 *Ibid.*

### 21 ***The LPA’s Relation to NASA’s Exclusive Franchise***

22 The LPA contains several provisions addressing the relationship  
 23 between the LPA and the City’s award of an exclusive franchise to NASA  
 24 under the Franchise Ordinance. These provisions will be analyzed in more  
 25 detail in the “Argument” Section below, but will be summarized here.

26 First, Paragraph 1 of the LPA states that “[t]he terms of this  
 27 Agreement shall only become operative if all of the conditions set forth in  
 28

1 paragraph 15 are satisfied.” Paragraph 1 thus recites Paragraph 15 as  
 2 containing the relevant provisions on the “operation” of the Agreement.

3 Paragraph 15 contains three provisions on the relationship between  
 4 the LPA and the award of an exclusive franchise. First, it states: “All of the  
 5 paragraphs of this Agreement are expressly conditioned on the City of Los  
 6 Angeles entering into an exclusive franchise agreement or franchise  
 7 agreements with the Employer for the collection of solid waste pursuant to  
 8 the City of Los Angeles Municipal Code, Article 6, Chapter VI, §§ 66.33.1 *et*  
 9 *seq.*” Doc. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 15. As will be demonstrated below, this condition  
 10 is met. It is not disputed that NASA has entered into an exclusive  
 11 franchise agreement with the City.

12 Second, Paragraph 15 states that “[i]f the City enters into an  
 13 exclusive franchise agreement for the collection of solid waste with the  
 14 Employer, then the terms of this Agreement shall remain in effect for three  
 15 years following the effective date of the exclusive franchise agreement  
 16 between the City and the Employer.” Doc. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 15. Again, there  
 17 is no dispute that NASA has entered into an exclusive franchise with the  
 18 City, so the condition triggering a three-year term to the LPA is also met.

19 The parties dispute the meaning of Paragraph 15’s third sentence. It  
 20 states that “[i]f the City fails to enter into an exclusive franchise agreement  
 21 for the collection of solid waste with the Employer by December 31, 2016,  
 22 then this Agreement shall *become null and void.*” Doc. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 15  
 23 (emphasis added).

24 As described in more detail below, the Union’s position is that this  
 25 condition was met—and the LPA did not “become null and void” on  
 26 December 31, 2016—because the City “entered into an exclusive franchise  
 27 agreement” with NASA prior to December 31, 2016. The fact that a city  
 28 official did not complete the ministerial act of physically signing the

1 exclusive franchise agreement until January 31, 2017 does not destroy the  
2 benefit of the parties' bargain. NASA's position, by contrast, is that the  
3 parties' LPA—which was an essential condition on which NASA received  
4 the exclusive franchise in the first place—was nullified because the City's  
5 Commissioner of Public Works did not sign the exclusive franchise  
6 agreement until January 31, 2016. This brief will demonstrate that the  
7 question of who is right is a matter of contractual interpretation for an  
8 arbitrator to decide.

9 ***The City's Award of an Exclusive Franchise to NASA***

10 The City went through a multi-step process in awarding exclusive  
11 franchises under the Franchise Ordinance. The City's Bureau of Sanitation  
12 and Bureau of Contract Administration created evaluation teams to review  
13 and rank the fifteen waste-hauling companies that submitted proposals  
14 responsive to the RFP. *See* Department of Public Works, Authority to  
15 Award Contracts for the Zero Waste LA Exclusive Franchise System for  
16 Commercial and Multifamily Solid Waste Collection and Handling –  
17 Bureau of Sanitation (LASAN)" (September 26, 2016), RJN, Exh. 3, at 11-  
18 15. Based on these evaluations, the City selected a smaller group of  
19 proposers, including NASA, with which to negotiate franchise agreements.  
20 *Id.*, Exh. 3, at 16. Negotiations over the contents of the exclusive franchise  
21 agreements continued until July 2016. *Id.*, Exh. 3, at 17.

22 Following the negotiation of an exclusive franchise agreement, the  
23 Bureau of Sanitation recommended to the City's Board of Public Works  
24 that NASA be awarded the exclusive franchise for the "Downtown"  
25 franchise zone, a zone comprising some 1,700 commercial and multi-family  
26 residential accounts. *Id.*, Exh. 3, at 19. The Bureau of Sanitation  
27 forwarded its recommendation to the Board of Public Works, which  
28 unanimously approved the recommendation that NASA be awarded the

1 Downtown zone, approved the franchise agreement between NASA and the  
 2 City, and forwarded the report and the franchise agreement to the Mayor  
 3 and the City Council. *See* Journal of the Board of Public Works, September  
 4 26, 2016, RJD, Exh. 4. The Board of Public Works described the  
 5 ministerial act that would follow once NASA's franchise agreement was  
 6 approved by the Mayor and the City Council: "Upon the Mayor's and the  
 7 Council's authorization, the President or two members of the Board *will*  
 8 *execute* the contract[.]" *Ibid.* (emphasis added).

9 The Mayor approved NASA's exclusive franchise agreement (and the  
 10 other franchisees' agreements) on November 3, 2016 and forwarded the  
 11 matter to the City Council. *See* Mayor of the City of Los Angeles,  
 12 Transmittal: Seven Franchise Agreements for Commercial and Multi-  
 13 family Solid Waste Collection and Handling, RJD, Exh. 5.

14 The City Council referred the matter to its Energy and Environment  
 15 Committee, which recommended that the Council approve the franchise  
 16 agreements and authorize the Board of Public Works to "execute a personal  
 17 services contract for the City's Exclusive Franchise System for commercial  
 18 and multifamily solid waste collection and handling with" NASA. City of  
 19 Los Angeles Council, Energy and Environment Committee Report, File No.  
 20 10-1797-S17; 10-1797-S16, RJD Exh. 6. The City Council approved the  
 21 Committee Report—and with it, the franchise agreement between the City  
 22 and NASA—on December 9, 2016. *See* Official Action of the Los Angeles  
 23 City Council, File No. 10-1797-S17, RJD, Exh. 7. The City Council's action  
 24 approving NASA's franchise agreement and directing the Board of Public  
 25 Works to execute the contract became final on December 13, 2016. *Ibid.*

26 The President of the Board of Public Works executed NASA's  
 27 exclusive franchise agreement on January 31, 2017. *See* Personal Services  
 28 Contract Between the City of Los Angeles and NASA Services, Inc.

1 (“Franchise Agreement”), Contract No. C-128876, RJD Exh. 8, at p. 142.  
 2 NASA’s President, Arsen Sarkisian, had executed the franchise agreement  
 3 on September 5, 2016, and the City Attorney’s Office had approved it as to  
 4 form on September 15, 2016. Franchise Agreement, RJD Exh. 8, at p. 142.

5 Section 3.15 of NASA’s exclusive franchise contract requires that  
 6 NASA “provide, and maintain for the term of the Agreement, satisfactory  
 7 evidence that it complies with [L.A. Municipal Code] Section 66.33.6(c)” —  
 8 the requirement that NASA be a party to a labor peace agreement.

9 Franchise Agreement, RJD Exh. 8, at p. 26. The existence of a valid labor  
 10 peace agreement with the Union was therefore a condition on which the  
 11 City entered into the exclusive franchise agreement with NASA.

12 ***The Union’s Meetings with NASA and Demand for Arbitration***

13 On February 14, 2017, the Union sent NASA a notice of its intent to  
 14 organize, as provided for in Paragraph 7 of the LPA. Smith Decl., ¶ 2, Exh.  
 15 1. The Union did not hear back from NASA, and so it sent a second notice  
 16 on April 10, 2017. *Id.*, ¶ 3, Exh. 2. After this second notice, the Union  
 17 began to communicate with a consultant of NASA’s named Mario Beltran.  
 18 *Id.*, ¶ 4. During the conversations that Union representatives had with Mr.  
 19 Beltran, he did not assert that the parties’ LPA was void or not in effect.

20 Instead, Mr. Beltran brokered a meeting between the Union’s  
 21 representatives and NASA’s officials. This meeting took place on July 24,  
 22 2017 at a restaurant called Vespaio, in downtown Los Angeles. *Id.*, ¶ 5.  
 23 Present at this meeting were Union Secretary-Treasurer Ron Herrera,  
 24 Union Director of Organizing Jim Smith, Union Vice President Javier  
 25 Bonales, Mr. Beltran, NASA’s President Arsen Sarkisian, and NASA  
 26 official Nick Sarkisian. The Union expressed its displeasure that NASA  
 27 had not complied with its obligations under the LPA, such as providing the  
 28 Union with a list of its employees and agreeing to allow union

1 representatives to access its facilities. Neither Mr. Sarkisian nor Mr.  
2 Beltran asserted at this meeting that the parties' LPA was void or  
3 inoperative. Instead, they told the Union that it had been difficult to  
4 comply with the LPA because NASA was still transitioning into the city  
5 franchise. Mr. Sarkisian asked that NASA be given time to transition  
6 before the Union began organizing under the LPA. The Union's Secretary-  
7 Treasurer agreed, and asked Mr. Smith and Mr. Beltran to follow up with a  
8 plan on complying with the LPA. *Ibid.*

9 Mr. Beltran, Union Organizing Director Jim Smith, and Union  
10 Secretary-Treasurer Ron Herrera held another meeting on August 14, 2017  
11 at the Union's offices in Covina, California. *Id.*, ¶ 6. At this meeting, Mr.  
12 Beltran and the union officials continued their discussion of a timeline for  
13 NASA's compliance with the LPA. At no point during this meeting did Mr.  
14 Beltran state that NASA believed the LPA to be inoperative or void. Mr.  
15 Beltran told the Union that NASA would provide the information required  
16 of it in the LPA in the near future, and asked Mr. Smith to reach out to him  
17 again. Mr. Smith did so over the ensuing month and a half. *Id.*, ¶ 7, Exh.  
18 3. Again, Mr. Beltran did not respond by informing the Union that the  
19 LPA was not in effect. Instead, he told Mr. Smith that he was meeting  
20 with NASA's owners, which the Union understood to mean that NASA  
21 would soon comply with its obligations.

22 Throughout 2017, the Union forewent its federally protected rights to  
23 picket and take other economic action against NASA. It did not picket or  
24 boycott NASA—something that it would normally do against a recalcitrant  
25 employer—because the LPA forbids it from doing so. If NASA had  
26 responded to the Union's notices of its intent to organize employees in  
27 February 2017 by stating forthrightly its position that it believed the LPA  
28 to be void, then the Union might have elected to take economic action

1 against NASA at a time when it was particularly vulnerable, during its  
 2 transition to the new franchise. Smith Decl., ¶ 8. Instead, NASA benefited  
 3 from a year (and more) of labor peace with the Union based on a contract  
 4 that it now claims to have always been null and void.

5 On November 28, 2017—after months of delay from NASA—the  
 6 Union informed Arbitrator Rappaport that the Union and NASA had a  
 7 dispute under the LPA. More Decl., ¶ 7, Exh. 4. On December 8, 2017,  
 8 NASA’s counsel wrote to Arbitrator Rappaport, declining to arbitrate and  
 9 stating that “NASA and Local 396 are not parties to any agreement.” *Id.*, ¶  
 10 8, Exh. 5. On February 2, 2018, the Union wrote to NASA’s counsel, citing  
 11 *Buckeye Check Cashing*, 546 U.S. 440, 446 and asking NASA to reconsider  
 12 its refusal to arbitrate the dispute. *Id.*, ¶ 9, Exh. 6. NASA again declined  
 13 to arbitrate the parties’ dispute, and this action followed.

## 14 ARGUMENT

### 15 I. NASA Bears the Heavy Burden of Demonstrating That the Parties’ 16 Dispute is Not Arbitrable.

17 Labor peace agreements like the one here are governed by Labor-  
 18 Management Relations Act (“LMRA”), Section 301, 29 U.S.C. § 185. *See*,  
 19 *e.g.*, *Service Employees Int’l Union v. St. Vincent Medical Ctr.*, 344 F.3d  
 20 977, 979 (9th Cir. 2003); *Hotel Employees & Restaurant Employees Local 2*  
 21 *v. Marriott Corp.*, 961 F.2d 1464, 1466 (9th Cir. 1992); *United Steel, Paper,*  
 22 *etc. v. TriMas Corp.*, 531 F.3d 531, 533 (7th Cir. 2008); *see also* Doc. No. 10,  
 23 ¶ 1(e) (recognizing jurisdiction under § 301). Relying on the federal  
 24 common-law principles developed under § 301, federal courts have ordered  
 25 arbitration of disputes arising out of these agreements. *TriMas Corp.*, 531  
 26 F.3d at 533; *St. Vincent Medical Center*, 344 F.3d at 985-86; *South Bay*  
 27 *Boston Mgmt., Inc. v. Unite Here Local 26*, 587 F.3d 35, 38 (2009).

28

1 Courts “rigorously enforce agreements to arbitrate.” *Moses Cone*  
 2 *Mem'l Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp.*, 460 U.S. 1, 24 (1983). “In labor  
 3 contracts with arbitration clauses, the presumption of arbitrability is very  
 4 strong.” *Dennis L. Christensen General Building Contractor, Inc., v.*  
 5 *General Building Contractor, Inc.*, 952 F.2d 1073, 1076 (9th Cir. 1991).  
 6 “[W]here the contract contains an arbitration clause, there is a  
 7 presumption of arbitrability in the sense that ‘[a]n order to arbitrate the  
 8 particular grievance should not be denied unless it may be said with  
 9 positive assurance that the arbitration clause is not susceptible of an  
 10 interpretation that covers the asserted dispute. Doubts should be resolved  
 11 in favor of coverage.” *Id.* at 1076-1077 (quoting *AT&T Technologies v.*  
 12 *Communications Workers*, 475 U.S. 643, 650 (1986)); *United Steelworkers*  
 13 *v. Warrior & Gulf Navigation Co.*, 363 U.S. 574, 582-83 (1960). “The party  
 14 challenging arbitrability bears the burden of showing a [labor-management  
 15 agreement] excludes a particular dispute from arbitration.” *United*  
 16 *Brotherhood of Carpenters & Joiners of America, Local No. 1780 v. Desert*  
 17 *Palace, Inc.*, 94 F.3d 1308, 1309 (9th Cir. 1996).

18 Courts have applied Federal Arbitration Act (“FAA”) procedures to §  
 19 301 claims for breach of an arbitration provision to the extent they are  
 20 consistent with the LMRA. *See Matthews v. Nat'l Football League Mgmt.*  
*Council*, 688 F.3d 1107, 1115 & n. 7 (9th Cir. 2012) (applying the FAA in a  
 21 case brought pursuant to § 301); *Smart v. Int'l Broth. Of Elec. Workers,*  
*Local 702*, 315 F.3d 721, 724 (7th Cir. 2002) (“The Federal Arbitration Act  
 22 has no particular reference to [collective bargaining] contracts and so if  
 23 there were a conflict between the two statutes we would resolve it in favor  
 24 of section 301. Where there is no conflict, however, and the FAA provides a  
 25 procedure or remedy not found in section 301 but does not step on section  
 26 301’s toes, then . . . we apply the Federal Arbitration Act.” (citation  
 27 28

omitted); *Oil Chem. & Atomic Workers Int'l Union v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 457 F.Supp. 179, 180 (C.D. Cal. 1978) (applying § 4 of the FAA to petition to compel arbitration of action arising under § 301)

Under the FAA, a party “aggrieved by the alleged . . . refusal of another to arbitrate” may file a petition in federal district court for an order compelling arbitration in the manner provided for in the agreement. *Id.* § 4. The FAA supersedes the normal operation of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Fed. R. Civ. P. 81(a)(6)(B). An application under the FAA is made and heard in the manner provided for the making and hearing of motions. 9 U.S.C. § 10; *see Bridgeport Mgmt., Inc. v. Lake Mathews Mineral Properties, Ltd.*, No. 14-CV-00070-JST, 2014 WL 953831, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 6, 2014) (“The FAA provides for petitions to be treated as motions, not complaints.”). The summary procedure under the FAA is consistent with the strong federal policy in favor of labor arbitration.

## II. Whether the Agreement “Became Null and Void” on January 1, 2017 is for the Arbitrator to Decide.

### A. Under Buckeye Cashing, only challenges to an arbitration clause, not challenges to the contract itself, are for the courts to decide.

In *Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegn*, *supra*, 546 U.S. 440, the Supreme Court held that under federal law, arbitration clauses are severable from the remainder of the contract and that only challenges to the validity of an arbitration clause itself are matters for the courts:

First, as a matter of substantive federal arbitration law, an arbitration provision is severable from the remainder of the contract. Second, unless the challenge is to the arbitration clause itself, the issue of the contract’s validity is considered by the arbitrator in the first instance.

440 U.S. at 445-46 (citing *Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co.*, 388 U.S. 395 (1967)). The question of whether the parties’ agreement

1 was void due to usurious interest rates was for the arbitrator, because the  
 2 challenge was to the validity of the entire contract. The Court recognized  
 3 that enforcing this rule “permits a court to enforce an arbitration  
 4 agreement in a contract that the arbitrator later finds to be void. But it is  
 5 equally true that respondents’ approach permits a court to deny effect to an  
 6 arbitration provision in a contract that the court later finds to be perfectly  
 7 enforceable.” *Buckeye Check Cashing*, 546 U.S. at 448–49. The Court  
 8 resolved this dilemma in favor of arbitration. *Id.* at 449.

9 The Supreme Court reiterated the rule in *Rent-A-Ctr., W., Inc. v.*  
 10 *Jackson*, 561 U.S. 63, 70 (2010):

11 There are two types of validity challenges under § 2: “One type  
 12 challenges specifically the validity of the agreement to arbitrate,” and  
 13 “[t]he other challenges the contract as a whole, either on a ground  
 14 that directly affects the entire agreement (e.g., the agreement was  
 15 fraudulently induced), or on the ground that the illegality of one of  
 16 the contract’s provisions renders the whole contract invalid.”

17 *Buckeye*, 546 U.S. at 444. In a line of cases neither party has asked  
 18 us to overrule, we held that only the first type of challenge is relevant  
 19 to a court’s determination whether the arbitration agreement at issue  
 20 is enforceable.

21 *See also Tompkins v. 23andMe, Inc.*, 840 F.3d 1016, 1032 (9th Cir. 2016)  
 22 (“[I]f the plaintiff does not specifically and directly challenge the ‘precise  
 23 agreement to arbitrate at issue,’ a court must treat the arbitration  
 24 agreement as valid under [FAA] § 2 and enforce it, thereby letting the  
 25 arbitrator decide questions as to the validity of other provisions in the first  
 26 instance[.]”); *Nicaragua v. Standard Fruit Company*, 937 F.2d 469, 477  
 27 (9th Cir. 1991) (the question is not “whether the contract [containing an  
 28 arbitration clause] was valid or enforceable—just that it existed” and  
 “where the parties admit to signing a document that contains an

1 arbitration clause . . . all questions regarding breach of the agreement must  
 2 be referred to arbitration.”).

3 Here, NASA challenges the validity of the *entire agreement* by citing  
 4 the Paragraph 15’s language and claiming that the City did not “enter into  
 5 an exclusive franchise agreement” with the City by December 31, 2016.  
 6 NASA does not challenge the arbitration clause contained in Paragraph 14  
 7 specifically. NASA’s view is that Paragraph 15’s language was not met  
 8 because the Los Angeles Board of Public Works President had not  
 9 physically signed the Franchise Agreement by that date. Doc. No. 10, at ¶¶  
 10 1(c), 1(d).

11 By contrast, the Union asserts that the City had “entered into an  
 12 exclusive franchise agreement” with NASA before December 31, 2016  
 13 because it had taken all of the discretionary, legislative steps necessary to  
 14 enter into the Franchise Agreement.

15 Under California law, the Board of Public Works President’s act of  
 16 physically signing the document was ministerial and mandatory because  
 17 the legislative steps of awarding the franchise to NASA were complete.  
 18 *Transdyn/Cresci v. City & Cty. of San Francisco*, 72 Cal.App.4th 746, 748  
 19 (1999). In *Transdyn/Cresci*, the California court of appeal held that the  
 20 San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s general manager’s refusal to  
 21 sign a public contract after the PUC “had passed an original resolution  
 22 awarding the contract to appellant pursuant to competitive bidding laws  
 23 exceeded the scope of the Department Head’s legal authority.” *Ibid.* The  
 24 fact that San Francisco’s City Charter required the Department Head’s  
 25 “signature” on public contracts did not give the general manager discretion  
 26 to refuse to sign after the discretionary award of the public contract had  
 27 taken place. *Id.* at 757. *Transdyn/Cresci* relied on an earlier California  
 28 Supreme Court decision holding that when a city’s mayor, “as an officer of

1 the city, was authorized and directed by the duly adopted resolution of the  
 2 council to sign the same, it became his duty to do so as a duty resulting  
 3 from his office. The mayor's duty to sign the contract was ministerial only,  
 4 and involved the exercise of no discretionary power." *Williams v. City of*  
 5 *Stockton*, 195 Cal. 743, 747 (1925).

6 Here, the Union maintains that it should not be denied benefit of its  
 7 bargain—and the parties' clear intent to have the LPA apply if NASA  
 8 received a franchise—based on the fact that the Board of Public Works  
 9 President did not complete the ministerial act of signing the Franchise  
 10 Agreement until January 31, 2016. *See Navarro v. F.D.I.C.*, 371 F.3d 979,  
 11 981 (7th Cir. 2004) ("Conditions precedent are generally disfavored; in  
 12 resolving doubts about whether a contract contains a condition precedent,  
 13 interpretations that reduce the risk of forfeiture are favored.") (citing  
 14 *Restatement (Second) of Contracts* § 227(1) (1981)). The discretionary  
 15 approvals awarding the Franchise Agreement to NASA had all been  
 16 completed by December 13, 2016. The Board President—who had already  
 17 voted with all of his fellow commissioners to enter into the Franchise  
 18 Agreement with NASA—had a ministerial duty to sign the Franchise  
 19 Agreement, which he did. The City had "entered into the exclusive  
 20 franchise agreement" with NASA within the meaning of Paragraph 15 by  
 21 December 13, 2016.

22 Because NASA's challenge is not specifically to the parties'  
 23 arbitration clause, this question of contractual interpretation is for the  
 24 arbitrator, not for the courts. *Buckeye Check Cashing*, 546 U.S. at 449  
 25 ("[A] challenge to the *validity* of the contract as a whole, and not  
 26 specifically to the arbitration clause, must go to the arbitrator."). Just as in  
 27 *Buckeye Check Cashing*, it is possible (though, in the Union's view,  
 28 unlikely) that the arbitrator could interpret the LPA's language and

1 conclude that the LPA became void under the terms set forth in Paragraph  
 2 15. But the Supreme Court held that the risk that an arbitrator will  
 3 determine that a contract containing an arbitration clause is void is  
 4 preferable to a court ignoring the parties' arbitration clause and resolving  
 5 the parties' contractual dispute in the first instance. *Buckeye Check*  
 6 *Cashing*, 546 U.S. at 448–49.

7 **B. Disputes over the effectiveness of conditions precedent are**  
 8 **arbitrable under *Buckeye Cashing*.**

9 NASA claims that Paragraph 15 contains a "condition precedent"  
 10 whose operation must be adjudicated by the Court. Doc. No. 10, at ¶ 1(b).  
 11 The language in Paragraph 15 is not that of a condition *precedent* but of a  
 12 condition *subsequent*. Paragraph 15 states that if the City does not "enter  
 13 into an exclusive franchise agreement" by December 31, 2016, then "this  
 14 Agreement shall *become* null and void." Doc. No. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 15.  
 15 Something can only "become" null and void if it has been something else  
 16 previously.

17 The parties acted as if the LPA was in effect prior to December 31,  
 18 2016. NASA and the Union selected an arbitrator pursuant to Paragraph  
 19 14, and NASA granted the Union a 30-day extension on the contractual  
 20 timeframe for selecting an arbitrator under that Paragraph. In obtaining a  
 21 lucrative franchise, NASA represented to the City, without qualification,  
 22 that it was a "party to an agreement with Teamsters Local Union No. 396  
 23 that meets the definition of a Labor Peace Agreement." More Decl., Exh. 1.

24 But even if NASA were correct that Paragraph 15 contains a  
 25 "condition precedent," the job of interpreting this provision to determine  
 26 whether it is met belongs to the arbitrator. Federal courts have regularly  
 27 held that conditions precedent are arbitrable under the *Prima Paint/*  
 28 *Buckeye Check Cashing* rule. *See, e.g., U.S. Titan, Inc. v. Guangzhou Zhen*

1 *Hua Shipping Co.*, 182 F.R.D. 97, 102 (S.D.N.Y. 1998), aff'd, 241 F.3d 135  
 2 (2d Cir. 2001) ("[I]t has been repeatedly held that even a dispute regarding  
 3 the satisfaction of a condition precedent to a contract will be referred to  
 4 arbitration if it may reasonably be said to come within the scope of an  
 5 arbitration clause."); *Capitol Vial, Inc. v. Weber Scientific*, 966 F.Supp.  
 6 1108, 1111 (M.D.Ala. 1997) (a "dispute over a condition precedent to a  
 7 contract containing an arbitration clause that is broadly enough worded to  
 8 encompass such a dispute should be arbitrated").

9 One federal district court applied this line of cases to the claim that a  
 10 labor peace agreement never came into effect because of the failure of a  
 11 condition precedent. In *Unite Here Local 355 v. Calder Race Course, Inc.*,  
 12 No. 10-22355-CIV, 2010 WL 11553588, at \*2 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 7, 2010), the  
 13 union and a race course developer entered into a labor peace agreement  
 14 covering future employees. In opposing the union's motion to compel  
 15 arbitration, the developer argued that the agreement was void because a  
 16 condition precedent—the passage of a 2004 initiative permitting casino-  
 17 style gaming—did not occur. *Id.* at \*1. The court rejected this argument,  
 18 holding that under *Buckeye Check Cashing*, because the developer's  
 19 challenge "pertains to the validity of the MOA as a whole and not the  
 20 arbitration clause itself, the agreement to arbitrate is enforceable, and the  
 21 question of the contract's validity should go to the arbitrator." *Id.* at \*2.

22 Even if NASA's claim here that the LPA "became null and void" on  
 23 December 31, 2016 could be characterized as a condition precedent, it is a  
 24 pure matter of contract interpretation that must be decided by the  
 25 arbitrator.

26  
 27  
 28

1                   **C. The parties do not have a dispute about contract formation within**  
 2                   **the meaning of *Granite Rock*.**

3                   Finally, NASA asserts that the parties' dispute is one of "contract  
 4 formation" that the Court must resolve under *Granite Rock Co. v.*  
 5 *International Brotherhood of Teamsters*, 561 U.S. 287 (2010). Doc. No. 10,  
 6 at ¶ 1(a). But this misreads the scope of *Granite Rock*, which dealt with  
 7 the technical failure of contract formation, such as "whether the alleged  
 8 obligor ever signed the contract, whether the signor lacked authority to  
 9 commit the alleged principal, and whether the signor lacked the mental  
 10 capacity to assent[.]" *Buckeye Check Cashing*, 546 U.S. at 444 n.1.  
 11 *Granite Rock* did not purport to overrule *Prima Paint* and *Buckeye Check*  
 12 *Cashing*, and did not rule that interpreting a purported condition precedent  
 13 in an admittedly executed contract is reserved to the courts.

14                  *Granite Rock* involved a different form of contract formation  
 15 dispute—one similar to the question of whether a contract was signed, but  
 16 specific to the labor context. In *Granite Rock*, the dispute was over when a  
 17 collective-bargaining agreement ("CBA") had been ratified by the union's  
 18 membership. Such ratification was necessary in order for the CBA to be  
 19 formed, and the date of the ratification was important to determine  
 20 whether the union had struck in violation of the CBA. *Granite Rock*, 561  
 21 U.S. at 292-93. The question of the CBA's ratification date did not involve  
 22 any interpretation of the CBA; the facts relating to the ratification lay  
 23 entirely outside of the contract's language. *Id.* at 305-06.

24                  Federal courts have rejected the contention that the applicability of a  
 25 condition precedent is one of contract formation under *Granite Rock*.  
 26 *Solymar Investments, Ltd. v. Banco Santander S.A.*, 672 F.3d 981, 997  
 27 (11th Cir. 2012) (rejecting characterization of condition precedent to  
 28 contract as a matter of contract formation under *Granite Rock*); *Sheet*

1 *Metal Workers' Int'l Ass'n v. United Transp. Union*, 767 F. Supp. 2d 161,  
 2 177 (D.D.C. 2011) ("UTU concedes that 'a Merger Agreement was entered  
 3 into between [SMWIA] and [UTU],' . . . and disputes only whether the  
 4 conditions precedent to the merger (and the *continuing* effectiveness of the  
 5 Merger Agreement) have been satisfied. It is the role of the arbitrator, not  
 6 the Court, to apply and interpret the terms and conditions of the Merger  
 7 Agreement. UTU cannot simply label the dispute as one of contract  
 8 formation and thereby avoid arbitration.").

9 NASA does not dispute that it entered into the LPA with the Union or  
 10 that the LPA contains an arbitration clause under which "any disputes  
 11 over the interpretation or application of this Agreement shall be submitted  
 12 to expedited and binding arbitration." Doc. No. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 15. Nor can  
 13 NASA dispute that it has represented to the City that the LPA is a valid  
 14 agreement to which it is a party. Whether that parties' agreement "became  
 15 null and void" through the happening of a contractual condition is a matter  
 16 of contract interpretation for the arbitrator. Where the parties have  
 17 indisputably executed a contract with one another containing a broad  
 18 arbitration clause and then dispute the existence of a condition set forth in  
 19 the agreement, merely labeling the dispute as one of "contract formation"  
 20 does not allow a party to bypass arbitration. *Cf. Granite Rock*, 561 U.S. at  
 21 304 n.11 ("[I]t is not the mere labeling of a dispute for contract law  
 22 purposes that determines whether an issue is arbitrable.").

23 Moreover, the CBA at issue in *Granite Rock* limited arbitration to  
 24 disputes that "arise under" the CBA, unlike the arbitration clause in the  
 25 LPA here, which covers "any dispute over [the Agreement's] interpretation  
 26 or application." Doc. No. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 14; *see Unite Here Local 217 v.*  
 27 *Sage Hosp. Res.*, 642 F.3d 255, 262 n.6 (1st Cir. 2011) (distinguishing  
 28 *Granite Rock* on this basis). Because the parties committed disputes over

1 the LPA’s “interpretation” to arbitration—and jointly selected an arbitrator  
 2 to hear those disputes—the question of whether the condition set forth in  
 3 Paragraph 15 have been met is arbitrable.

4 **III. NASA Waived Its Claim that the LPA Became Void by Accepting the  
 5 Agreement’s Benefits.**

6 When a party believes that an agreement is voidable, it is required to  
 7 promptly give notice and enforce its rights. If it does not do so and benefits  
 8 from the contract, then the right is waived. *See, e.g., Citicorp Real Estate,  
 9 Inc. v. Smith*, 155 F.3d 1097, 1103 (9th Cir. 1998) (“in order to escape from  
 10 its obligation the aggrieved party must rescind by prompt notice and offer  
 11 to restore the consideration received, if any.”) (quoting 1 B.E.

12 Witkin, *Summary of California Law, Contracts* § 403 (9th ed. 1987, Supp.  
 13 1997); Cal. Civil Code § 1691; *Nash v. UCSF Med. Ctr.*, No. 11-CV-4473  
 14 JSC, 2013 WL 4487503, at \*3 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2013) (applying  
 15 California Civil Code § 1691 to voidable contract).

16 In two cases, federal courts ruling on § 301 motions to compel  
 17 arbitration under labor peace agreements like the one here have held that  
 18 the non-performing party’s failure to promptly repudiate the agreement  
 19 constitutes a waiver. In *Hotel Employees & Rest. Employees Union, Local  
 20 2 v. Marriott Corp.*, No. C-89-2707 MHP, 1993 WL 341286, at \*9 (N.D. Cal.  
 21 Aug. 23, 1993), San Francisco required that a hotel developer enter into a  
 22 labor peace agreement with a union. After the hotel was built and  
 23 operations commenced, the union sought to enforce the agreement but the  
 24 hotel resisted. The hotel argued that the agreement was the product of  
 25 economic coercion. The federal district court held, however, that the hotel  
 26 had waived any claim that the agreement was voidable by benefitting from  
 27 the agreement, including its bar on the union taking economic action. *Ibid.*

28

1 (“It should be beyond cavil that a party cannot reap the benefits of a  
 2 bargain and then exercise its right to rescind.”).

3 The First Circuit also held that a party to a labor peace agreement  
 4 must promptly rescind the agreement when it believes it has a basis to do  
 5 so. *South Bay Boston Mgmt, supra*, 587 F.3d at 41-42. As in the *Marriott*  
 6 case, the First Circuit held that a party to a voidable contract “may not  
 7 enjoy[] the benefits of the Agreement” and then claim not to be bound when  
 8 the union seeks to compel arbitration. *Id.* at 42 (“Because its challenge is  
 9 not timely, South Bay has thus waived any right it may have had to void  
 10 the Agreement.”).

11 Here, the Union informed NASA of its intent to organize under the  
 12 LPA on February 14, 2017. NASA did not respond by asserting that it  
 13 believed the LPA to have become void or inoperative. Nor did NASA do so  
 14 after the Union sent a second notice of intent to organize in April 2017.  
 15 Representatives of NASA held two meetings with the Union in July and  
 16 August 2017. At neither of those meetings did NASA repudiate the LPA or  
 17 assert that it had become null and void. It was not until the Union stated  
 18 that it would seek to compel arbitration under the Agreement that NASA  
 19 asserted that the LPA was inoperative.

20 Throughout this time, NASA benefitted from the LPA because the  
 21 LPA constrained the Union from exerting economic action against the  
 22 company. NASA obviously believed that the guarantee of labor peace  
 23 amounted to valuable consideration when it negotiated the LPA. It  
 24 acquired an enforceable right to prevent strikes, picketing and other labor  
 25 disruption. *See American Mfg. Co., supra*, 363 U.S. at 567 (arbitration is  
 26 the *quid pro quo* for a union’s promise not to picket or strike over contract  
 27 disputes). Such economic action would have been particularly effective  
 28 during NASA’s transition to the exclusive franchise. That may be the

1 reason why NASA did not alert the Union of its position throughout 2017:  
 2 it wished to hold off any Union action against it until its new waste-  
 3 collection franchise was up and running.

4 NASA also benefitted directly from the LPA because the existence of  
 5 a valid labor peace agreement was a condition for the City to enter into the  
 6 Franchise Agreement with NASA. NASA represented that it was party to  
 7 a valid LPA with the Union both at the time when it responded to the RFP  
 8 and when it entered into the Franchise Agreement. It maintained that  
 9 position throughout 2017, to its benefit.

10 By failing to promptly repudiate the LPA—and by reaping the  
 11 benefits of the LPA throughout 2017—NASA waived its claim that the LPA  
 12 is inoperative.<sup>2</sup>

13 **IV. NASA Is Required to Pay the Union’s Legal Expenses as a Matter of  
 14 Contract.**

15 The parties agreed contractually that a party that “unsuccessfully  
 16 resists arbitration or an arbitration award under this Agreement shall be  
 17 liable for the other party’s legal fees and expenses for enforcement.” Doc.  
 18 No. 1, Exh. A, at ¶ 14. This contractual rule is unqualified. It does not  
 19 include an exception for resistance to arbitration based on a good-faith  
 20 belief or a substantially justified legal position.

21 Accordingly, if the Court grants the Union’s motion to compel  
 22 arbitration, it should require that NASA pay the legal fees and expenses  
 23 that the Union has expended in bringing this action.

24

25

---

26 <sup>2</sup> Alternatively, NASA is equitably estopped from taking this position. *See Morgan v.*  
 27 *Gonzales*, 495 F.3d 1084, 1092 (9th Cir. 2007) (outlining traditional elements of  
 28 equitable estoppel). “[E]quitable estoppel is available in actions under ERISA and the  
 LMRA.” *Directors of Motion Picture Indus. Pension Plan v. Nu Image Inc.*, No. 2:13-  
 CV-03224-CAS, 2014 WL 808859, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 28, 2014).

## CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant the Union's motion to compel arbitration and order NASA to pay the Union's reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in bringing this action.

McCRACKEN, STEMERMAN &  
HOLSBERRY LLP

By: /s/*Paul L. More*

Paul L. More

Attorneys for Petitioner

1 PROOF OF SERVICE  
2  
3

4 STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO  
5  
6

7 I am employed in the city and county of San Francisco, State of  
8 California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within  
9 action; my business address is: 595 Market Street, Suite 800, San Francisco,  
10 California 94105.

11 On July 23, 2018 I served a copy of the following document(s) described  
12 as:  
13

14 INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, LOCAL 396's  
15 BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION  
16  
17

18 on the interested party(ies) to this action as follows:  
19

20 By ECF System - Court's Notice of Electronic Filing:

21  
22 L Brent Garrett  
23 Atkinson Andelson Loya Ruud and Romo  
24 12800 Center Court Drive South Suite 300  
25 Cerritos, CA 90703  
26 562-653-3200  
27 Fax: 562-653-3333  
28 Email: bgarrett@aalrr.com

29  
30 *Atorneys for NASA Services, Inc.*

31  
32 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of  
33 California that the foregoing is true and correct.  
34

35 Executed on this 23rd day of July 2018, at San Francisco, California.  
36  
37

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
5530  
5531  
5532  
5533  
5534  
5535  
5536  
5537  
5538  
5539  
55310  
55311  
55312  
55313  
55314  
55315  
55316  
55317  
55318  
55319  
55320  
55321  
55322  
55323  
55324  
55325  
55326  
55327  
55328  
55329  
55330  
55331  
55332  
55333  
55334  
55335  
55336  
55337  
55338  
55339  
55340  
55341  
55342  
55343  
55344  
55345  
55346  
55347  
55348  
55349  
55350  
55351  
55352  
55353  
55354  
55355  
55356  
55357  
55358  
55359  
55360  
55361  
55362  
55363  
55364  
55365  
55366  
55367  
55368  
55369  
55370  
55371  
55372  
55373  
55374  
55375  
55376  
55377  
55378  
55379  
55380  
55381  
55382  
55383  
55384  
55385  
55386  
55387  
55388  
55389  
55390  
55391  
55392  
55393  
55394  
55395  
55396  
55397  
55398  
55399  
553100  
553101  
553102  
553103  
553104  
553105  
553106  
553107  
553108  
553109  
553110  
553111  
553112  
553113  
553114  
553115  
553116  
553117  
553118  
553119  
553120  
553121  
553122  
553123  
553124  
553125  
553126  
553127  
553128  
553129  
553130  
553131  
553132  
553133  
553134  
553135  
553136  
553137  
553138  
553139  
553140  
553141  
553142  
553143  
553144  
553145  
553146  
553147  
553148  
553149  
553150  
553151  
553152  
553153  
553154  
553155  
553156  
553157  
553158  
553159  
553160  
553161  
553162  
553163  
553164  
553165  
553166  
553167  
553168  
553169  
553170  
553171  
553172  
553173  
553174  
553175  
553176  
553177  
553178  
553179  
553180  
553181  
553182  
553183  
553184  
553185  
553186  
553187  
553188  
553189  
553190  
553191  
553192  
553193  
553194  
553195  
553196  
553197  
553198  
553199  
553200  
553201  
553202  
553203  
553204  
553205  
553206  
553207  
553208  
553209  
553210  
553211  
553212  
553213  
553214  
553215  
553216  
553217  
553218  
553219  
553220  
553221  
553222  
553223  
553224  
553225  
553226  
553227  
553228  
553229  
553230  
553231  
553232  
553233  
553234  
553235  
553236  
553237  
553238  
553239  
553240  
553241  
553242  
553243  
553244  
553245  
553246  
553247  
553248  
553249  
553250  
553251  
553252  
553253  
553254  
553255  
553256  
553257  
553258  
553259  
553260  
553261  
553262  
553263  
553264  
553265  
553266  
553267  
553268  
553269  
553270  
553271  
553272  
553273  
553274  
553275  
553276  
553277  
553278  
553279  
553280  
553281  
553282  
553283  
553284  
553285  
553286  
553287  
553288  
553289  
553290  
553291  
553292  
553293  
553294  
553295  
553296  
553297  
553298  
553299  
553300  
553301  
553302  
553303  
553304  
553305  
553306  
553307  
553308  
553309  
553310  
553311  
553312  
553313  
553314  
553315  
553316  
553317  
553318  
553319  
553320  
553321  
553322  
553323  
553324  
553325  
553326  
553327  
553328  
553329  
553330  
553331  
553332  
553333  
553334  
553335  
553336  
553337  
553338  
553339  
5533310  
5533311  
5533312  
5533313  
5533314  
5533315  
5533316  
5533317  
5533318  
5533319  
55333100  
55333101  
55333102  
55333103  
55333104  
55333105  
55333106  
55333107  
55333108  
55333109  
55333110  
55333111  
55333112  
55333113  
55333114  
55333115  
55333116  
55333117  
55333118  
55333119  
553331100  
553331101  
553331102  
553331103  
553331104  
553331105  
553331106  
553331107  
553331108  
553331109  
553331110  
553331111  
553331112  
553331113  
553331114  
553331115  
553331116  
553331117  
553331118  
553331119  
5533311100  
5533311101  
5533311102  
5533311103  
5533311104  
5533311105  
5533311106  
5533311107  
5533311108  
5533311109  
5533311110  
5533311111  
5533311112  
5533311113  
5533311114  
5533311115  
5533311116  
5533311117  
5533311118  
5533311119  
55333111100  
55333111101  
55333111102  
55333111103  
55333111104  
55333111105  
55333111106  
55333111107  
55333111108  
55333111109  
55333111110  
55333111111  
55333111112  
55333111113  
55333111114  
55333111115  
55333111116  
55333111117  
55333111118  
55333111119  
553331111100  
553331111101  
553331111102  
553331111103  
553331111104  
553331111105  
553331111106  
553331111107  
553331111108  
553331111109  
553331111110  
553331111111  
553331111112  
553331111113  
553331111114  
553331111115  
553331111116  
553331111117  
553331111118  
553331111119  
5533311111100  
5533311111101  
5533311111102  
5533311111103  
5533311111104  
5533311111105  
5533311111106  
5533311111107  
5533311111108  
5533311111109  
5533311111110  
5533311111111  
5533311111112  
5533311111113  
5533311111114  
5533311111115  
5533311111116  
5533311111117  
5533311111118  
5533311111119  
55333111111100  
55333111111101  
55333111111102  
55333111111103  
55333111111104  
55333111111105  
55333111111106  
55333111111107  
55333111111108  
55333111111109  
55333111111110  
55333111111111  
55333111111112  
55333111111113  
55333111111114  
55333111111115  
55333111111116  
55333111111117  
55333111111118  
55333111111119  
553331111111100  
553331111111101  
553331111111102  
553331111111103  
553331111111104  
553331111111105  
553331111111106  
553331111111107  
553331111111108  
553331111111109  
553331111111110  
553331111111111  
553331111111112  
553331111111113  
553331111111114  
553331111111115  
553331111111116  
553331111111117  
553331111111118  
553331111111119  
5533311111111100  
5533311111111101  
5533311111111102  
5533311111111103  
5533311111111104  
5533311111111105  
5533311111111106  
5533311111111107  
5533311111111108  
5533311111111109  
5533311111111110  
5533311111111111  
5533311111111112  
5533311111111113  
5533311111111114  
5533311111111115  
5533311111111116  
5533311111111117  
5533311111111118  
5533311111111119  
55333111111111100  
55333111111111101  
55333111111111102  
55333111111111103  
55333111111111104  
55333111111111105  
55333111111111106  
55333111111111107  
55333111111111108  
55333111111111109  
55333111111111110  
55333111111111111  
55333111111111112  
55333111111111113  
55333111111111114  
55333111111111115  
55333111111111116  
55333111111111117  
55333111111111118  
55333111111111119  
553331111111111100  
553331111111111101  
553331111111111102  
553331111111111103  
553331111111111104  
553331111111111105  
553331111111111106  
553331111111111107  
553331111111111108  
553331111111111109  
553331111111111110  
553331111111111111  
553331111111111112  
553331111111111113  
553331111111111114  
553331111111111115  
553331111111111116  
553331111111111117  
553331111111111118  
553331111111111119  
5533311111111111100  
5533311111111111101  
5533311111111111102  
5533311111111111103  
5533311111111111104  
5533311111111111105  
5533311111111111106  
5533311111111111107  
5533311111111111108  
5533311111111111109  
5533311111111111110  
5533311111111111111  
5533311111111111112  
5533311111111111113  
5533311111111111114  
5533311111111111115  
5533311111111111116  
5533311111111111117  
5533311111111111118  
5533311111111111119  
55333111111111111100  
55333111111111111101  
55333111111111111102  
55333111111111111103  
55333111111111111104  
55333111111111111105  
55333111111111111106  
55333111111111111107  
55333111111111111108  
55333111111111111109  
55333111111111111110  
55333111111111111111  
55333111111111111112  
55333111111111111113  
55333111111111111114  
55333111111111111115  
55333111111111111116  
55333111111111111117  
55333111111111111118  
55333111111111111119  
553331111111111111100  
553331111111111111101  
553331111111111111102  
553331111111111111103  
553331111111111111104  
553331111111111111105  
553331111111111111106  
553331111111111111107  
553331111111111111108  
553331111111111111109  
553331111111111111110  
553331111111111111111  
553331111111111111112  
553331111111111111113  
553331111111111111114  
553331111111111111115  
553331111111111111116  
553331111111111111117  
553331111111111111118  
553331111111111111119  
5533311111111111111100  
5533311111111111111101  
5533311111111111111102  
5533311111111111111103  
5533311111111111111104  
5533311111111111111105  
5533311111111111111106  
5533311111111111111107  
5533311111111111111108  
5533311111111111111109  
5533311111111111111110  
5533311111111111111111  
5533311111111111111112  
5533311111111111111113  
5533311111111111111114  
5533311111111111111115  
5533311111111111111116  
5533311111111111111117  
5533311111111111111118  
5533311111111111111119  
55333111111111111111100  
55